UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,690 02/23/2007 Jochen Beck		Jochen Beck	19345	2065
	7590 12/11/200 VTT, MURPHY & PRE	EXAMINER		
400 GARDEN	*	LOPEZ, FRANK D		
SUITE 300 GARDEN CIT	Y, NY 11530	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3745	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/564,690	BECK ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
F. DANIEL LOPEZ	3745	

	F. DANIEL LOPEZ	3745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 25 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	in.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706.07(f)		26(a) and the appropriat	a automoian faa
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slipset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on tension and the corresponding amount of the correct and	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wit AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	021160
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further con (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c 			ie issues ioi
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mplia n t Ame n dme n t (l	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alk non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (I	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
	/F. DANIEL LOPEZ/		
	Primary Evaminer Art II	nit 37/15	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The independent claims have been amended to include first through fourth pivot joints. This is a new issue and new matter since there is no discussion of pivot joints in the specification. The triangle points connecting the vehicle body (4) to the actuators can be considered pivot joints, but the other end of the actuators appear to be fixedly connected to the loading shovel 6 (i.e. no pivot points).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that the drawings only lack a detailed showing of the piston joints between the actuators and the working tool or shovel relative to the boom, and that it would be an obvious expedient that these connections are made by pivot joints. Applicant states that "merely a lack of presenting these minor details would not render the disclosure inadequate to one skilled in the art, since it is clear from the general structural description, that the shovel is tilted outwardly or inwardly by the tilting mechanism...and would not move vertically" (page 23 line 2-6). Applicant states that "Thus, in the absence of the pivot joints, which would be a natural or obvious expedient to be provided the inventive structure, the tilting mechanism would be inoperative inasmuch as the rod and cylinder would be fixed to the working tool or shovel in a fixed manner" (page 23 line 6-9).

The examiner contends that there is 2 problems with the specification, as discussed below. The examiner understands that the triangle points connecting the vehicle body (4) to the actuators can be considered pivot joints, but the other end of the actuators appear to be fixedly connected to the loading shovel 6 (i.e. no pivot points). Therefore, rather than the "minor details" of the piston joints not being shown, it would appear that the drawings show 2 pivot joints and 2 fixed joints.

The examiner disagrees with Applicant's labeling of the joints as "minor details". As Applicant states, without the pivot points the tilting mechanism is inoperative. Therefore, these details are not minor details, but critical to the operation of the invention. As such, they must be specifically disclosed or must be so well known in the prior art so that one of ordinary skill in this art would recognize from the disclosure the elements that are missing.

The prior art (e.g. Lech et al) has 2 actuators (50, e.g. fig 2A) tilting a shovel (28) relative to a boom (26). The actuators have pivot joints on both ends, connecting them to the boom and to the shovel. But, if the actuators is fluidly connected to a fluid source, so that one is extended while the other is retracted, the actuators would work against each other and the shovel would not move.

The examiner contends that there are 2 problems with the specification. The first problem is that the drawings show 2 pivot joints and 2 fixed joints, and as Applicant notes, the apparatus would not work with the fixed joints (i.e. they need pivot joints where the fixed joints are). The second problem is an overall explanation of how the actuators are connected between the boom and the shovel, to cause the shovel to tilt relative to the boom, is missing and not understood, even if all the joints were pivot joints. The 2 actuators can not be connected between the boom and the shovel the way prior art actuators were, because they would work against each other and the shovel would not move; making the system inoperative. Since neither the prior art nor the specification supplies the missing elements, to understand how the actuators are connected between the shovel and boom, especially with the 2 fixed joints; the specification is incomplete and any addition would be new matter.

The above arguments also apply to the lifting of the boom.

Applicant argues that claims 2 and 5 further limit claims 1 and 4, respectively, since claims 2 and 5 refer to relative sizes of the pressurization faces, and therefore the last 4 lines should not be deleted. The examiner agrees that the first 6 lines pertain to the relative sizes of the faces. But the last 4 lines claim that the pump is connected to the pressure chambers with each of the faces. Since this part has been claimed in claims 1 and 4, the last 4 lines are redundant and should therefore be deleted.